

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

IN RE: BRENDA JOYCE LITTLE,

Plaintiff.

Case No. MC21-011-RSM

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION
FOR RECONSIDERATION

This matter comes before the Court on pro se Plaintiff Brenda Joyce Little's Motion for Reconsideration. Dkt. #4. Plaintiff is currently under a Pre-Filing Bar Order entered on December 12, 2013 related to successive litigations against the State of Washington and the Washington State Bar Association ("WSBA"). *Little v. Washington State*, C13-1284RSL, Dkt. #57. Pursuant to the Bar Order, all of Plaintiff's pro se complaints in this district are subject to review by the Court prior to issuance of summons or service of process. The Bar Order states as follows:

The proposed complaint shall comply with Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a) and provide a clear statement of the factual and legal basis for each claim asserted and specifically identifying each defendant against whom the claim is asserted. The proposed complaint shall be accompanied by a signed statement explaining, on a claim-by-claim basis, (a) whether each claim was raised in any prior action (with an appropriate citation) and (b) why each claim is not barred by the doctrine of *res judicata* and/or the applicable immunity.

1 *Id.* at 5. The Bar Order provides that “[i]f the court determines that good cause has not been
2 shown, the action will be dismissed sua sponte without further notice.” *Id.*

3 On January 28, 2021, Plaintiff filed a complaint alleging constitutional violations, civil
4 rights violations, violations of the Americans with Disabilities Act and the Rehabilitation Act of
5 1973, and various claims including fraudulent inducement, practicing medicine without a license,
6 and Article III of the U.S. Constitution. Dkt. #1. The Court determined that Plaintiff’s complaint
7 failed to satisfy the basic notice pleading requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 8, as it failed to support
8 each cause of action with specific facts presented in a clear and understandable manner. *See* Dkt.
9 #3 at 2 (“It is difficult to identify which causes of action correspond with the various individuals
10 named throughout the pleading or how the instant claims differ from those already considered
11 and dismissed in previous actions.”). Furthermore, the complaint failed to provide the claim-by-
12 claim statement required under the Pre-Filing Bar Order. Accordingly, the Court concluded that
13 Plaintiff’s complaint shall not be permitted to proceed. *Id.* Plaintiff now moves for
14 reconsideration of the Court’s February 18, 2021 Order. Dkt. #4.

15 “Motions for reconsideration are disfavored.” Local Rules W.D. Wash. LCR 7(h)(1).
16 “The court will ordinarily deny such motions in the absence of a showing of manifest error in the
17 prior ruling or a showing of new facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to its
18 attention earlier with reasonable diligence.” *Id.*

19 Having reviewed Plaintiff’s motion, Dkt. #4, and her attached cover letter and declaration,
20 the Court finds no basis for granting the extraordinary remedy requested here. Plaintiff appears
21 to raise several arguments: (1) the Court’s order did not afford Plaintiff notice or opportunity to
22 be heard; (2) ex parte hearings are prohibited under Ninth Circuit law; (3) the Court lacks standing
23 to discriminate against Plaintiff; (4) the Court’s order failed to reference a compiled list of cases
24
25
26
27
28

1 and motions for appellate review and failed to reference substantive findings of frivolous or
2 harassment by Plaintiff. *Id.* at 1-10. Nothing in Plaintiff's motion or attachments addresses the
3 deficiencies identified by the Court in its previous order. It therefore fails to show manifest error
4 by the Court or a showing of new facts or legal authority that could have been brought to its
5 attention earlier. For these reasons, the Court DENIES Plaintiff's motion.
6

7 **CONCLUSION**

8 Having reviewed Plaintiff's Motion and the remainder of the record, it is hereby
9 ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration, Dkt. #4, is DENIED.
10

11 DATED this 29th day of March, 2021.
12

13 
14

15 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ
16 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28